



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,604	01/25/2001	Stephen M. Howard	EMC-002PUS	4397
22494	7590	05/06/2004	EXAMINER	
DALY, CROWLEY & MOFFORD, LLP SUITE 101 275 TURNPIKE STREET CANTON, MA 02021-2310			OSMAN, RAMY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	6
DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/769,604	HOWARD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ramy M Osman	2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claim 17 in U.S. Patent No. 6,704,886 contains every element of claim 15 of the instant application and is as such anticipated. This is a double patenting rejection.

Claims 16-20 are thus rejected because they are minor variations dependent on claim 15.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 1 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,766. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because submitting a list of restorable objects is inherently made prior to restore execution (Patent No. 6,721,766; column 2 lines 5-35, column 3 lines 5-20, column 8 line 60 – column 9 line 10 and column 10 lines 1-25). *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438 441-42, 164 USPQ 619, 622 (CCPA 1970), the court recognized that the invention claimed in an application is an obvious variation of an embodiment disclosed in the patent which provides support for the patent claim.

Claims 2-11 are thus rejected because they are minor variations dependent on claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 12-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Luong et al. (US Patent No. 6,684,229).

7. In reference to claim 12, Luong teaches a method of restoring backed up data (Abstract), comprising:

initiating a restore session for a first client via a dispatch daemon running on a data storage server through a graphical user interface associated with the client (Abstract, column 3 and column 17 line 25 – column 18 line 67);

creating a restore engine process in response to a request by the dispatch daemon (columns 3,12 and column 19 line 20 – column 20 line 40);

establishing a connection between the graphical user interface and the restore engine process (columns 3,11,12 and column 17 line 25 – column 20 line 40);

displaying a list of restorable objects for browsing by a user associated with the client via the graphical user interface under the control of the restore engine process (columns 3,11,12, column 14 lines 45-67 and column 17 line 25 – column 20 line 40);

determining restorable objects marked for restoration by the user under control of the restore engine process (columns 3,12 and column 17 line 25 – column 20 line 40);

storing a list of marked restorable objects submitted by the client to the restore engine process (columns 3,12,14 and column 17 line 45 – column 20 line 40); and

executing the restoration of the marked objects under control of the restore engine process independently of the browsing, marking and submitting of the restorable objects (columns 3,12,14, column 17 line 45 – column 20 line 40 and column 24).

8. In reference to claim 13, Luong teaches the method of claim 12, wherein the client communicates with the restore engine process via remote procedure calls (columns 3,11,12 and column 19 line 20 – column 20 line 40).

9. In reference to claim 14, Luong teaches the method of claim 12, further including supporting a new backup data method by adding a library corresponding to the new backup data method (columns 3,12,26 and 29).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M Osman whose telephone number is (703) 305-8050. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 305-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO
April 28, 2004


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100